

more loans to more would be homeowners based upon the energy value of a home.

In sum, this is the kind of program Members of Congress should encourage and facilitate. It is a market solution that works on the local level to save our precious energy resources and spread the dream of homeownership to more Americans.●

EXPLANATION FOR MISSED VOTE ON RULE TO H.R. 1149

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1983

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district yesterday when the House voted on the rule to H.R. 1149, the Oregon wilderness bill.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye," on adopting the rule.●

LAST WORD ON THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1983

● Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to draw attention to the book, "The Last Word on the Middle East" by Derek Prince.

Derek Prince has devoted a great part of his life to studying and the teaching of the Bible. He is internationally recognized as one of the leading Bible expositors of our time. He has authored 20 books, most of which have been translated into several foreign languages.

Nondenominational and nonsectarian in his approach, Mr. Prince has a prophetic insight into the significance of current events, especially those in the Middle East.

I strongly recommend this book to my colleagues. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have become keenly aware of the significance of this work to events now unfolding in the Middle East. Mr. Prince gives a firsthand account of the astonishing birth of the modern State of Israel against all odds. His research carries us through a fast-paced overview of the enemies and events that have swept the Jewish people along a tumultuous, heartbreaking course for 2,000 years.

I commend Mr. Prince on his work and insight into the Middle East. In fact, I am so impressed with his insight that I have distributed to all the members of the European and Middle East Subcommittee a copy of the book. It is my hope that the rest of my

fellow colleagues will read this important work by Mr. Prince.●

CARIBBEAN BASIN LEGISLATION

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1983

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing Caribbean Basin legislation similar to that introduced in the House in the last Congress. Although similar in most respects to the bill introduced last year, this legislation contains a provision of vital importance to the future of diversified agriculture in Hawaii.

Under the terms of my bill, many agricultural products not currently eligible for duty-free treatment under the generalized system of preferences (GSP)—but proposed for duty-free status under the administration's Caribbean Basin Initiative—continue to have duties imposed upon entry to the United States. This means that the following products would not be allowed to come into this country under duty-free status: Papaya, pineapple, macadamia nuts, and ginger root. This legislation is of critical importance to the future of diversified agriculture in my State.

As many of my colleagues may know, we in Hawaii are making every attempt to diversify our agricultural base in order to achieve essential economic growth and stability for our island economy. It is obvious that many of our agricultural products are import-sensitive. Therefore, it is critically important that these products be exempted from any legislation which establishes a Caribbean Basin Initiative. In Hawaii, we simply cannot compete with an unrestricted flow of foreign agricultural products from the Caribbean Basin—especially since many of these products compete successfully with the same products grown at home in Hawaii.

The President's Caribbean Basin Initiative bill asks Hawaii to compete with foreign agricultural producers whose labor, land, and other costs are much lower than ours. Our experience with sugar and pineapple is a perfect example. In recent years we have seen a steady decline in sugarcane and pineapple acreage, as well as a significant number of plantation closings. All this is attributable to foreign competition. Now, when we have a strong need to expand our agricultural base into diversified crops such as papaya, macadamia nuts, or ginger root, the Reagan administration is asking us to accept an unrestricted flow of foreign agricultural products which compete with Hawaii's production. This is hardly equitable.

You may also note that this legislation does not contain a specific exemp-

tion for sugar. Because of the import quotas and duties imposed on sugar as a consequence of the nonrecourse loan sugar loan program enacted in the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, foreign competition to Hawaii's sugar has been greatly reduced. Neither the bill I am introducing today nor the President's Caribbean Basin Initiative would alter the current loan program for domestic sugar.

Although the President's proposed Caribbean Basin Initiative was considered by Congress during the course of the 97th session, the measure was not enacted. Meaningful safeguards for Hawaii's diversified agriculture were not provided in the bill that year. I have, therefore, introduced this bill in order to create specific exemptions for Hawaii.

It is my earnest hope that this body will give this proposal the early action it deserves.

Without the consideration for Hawaii's products granted by my bill, I cannot support any Caribbean Basin Initiative.●

MOBILIZATION FOR ANIMALS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 thousands of citizens will gather throughout the Nation to express their views regarding animal experimentation in a "Mobilization for Animals."

The issue of animal experimentation has a profound moral dimension to it. In this area, more than in any other, we speak and act for those who have no means of defending themselves. Not just their welfare, but their lives, are in our hands.

Public disillusionment with science in general is increasing year by year. Never before has there been such a tide of moral outrage over what we have seen and heard is happening in our Nation's animal laboratories. However, what we face today is not a crusade against science per se. Rather, it is a movement set on defining our needs and determining how best to fill them without resorting to inhumane and uncivilized means. It is a sign that we are entering a new age of social and ethical considerations, for we now seek knowledge and benefit uncontaminated by brutality.

I believe with all my heart that those who champion the advancement of science and those who safeguard the lives and well-being of animals are not in separate camps. Indeed, they must concentrate on their commonalities and work together to achieve improvements in both areas. Progress can only come from the elimination of

March 22, 1983

unnecessary animal use and suffering. I am convinced that there is room for enormous improvement in how we conduct animal experimentation in this country, and I believe there is a role for the much greater participation of the public in securing these improvements.

The Mobilization for Animals, the first major international coalition of individuals and animal protection groups ever formed in our history, is picking up that torch of public conscientiousness. We should not be afraid of these developments, nor scorn them. We must open our minds to the ideas and goals of so many of our constituents, united now in a cause that will inevitably lead to the betterment of the human and nonhuman condition.

I urge you all to join with me in working toward that day.●

LETTER TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN UDALL

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 2195, a bill to deauthorize the O'Neill unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Nebraska. As an addendum to my remarks yesterday, I would like to submit for the RECORD the text of my letter to Chairman UDALL regarding this legislation and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1983.
Hon. MORRIS K. UDALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Longworth House Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Shortly, I will be introducing legislation to deauthorize the O'Neill Unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. Last December, during the lame duck session of the Congress, the House overwhelmingly rejected all construction funding for this project by a vote of 245-144. The House should now move promptly to deauthorize this project.

As you may recall, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill was not brought before the House. When the continuing resolution was considered, an amendment to strike current and previously appropriated funding was offered by myself and Congressman Thomas B. Evans, Jr.

In August of 1968, pursuant to the 1954 authorization, the Bureau of Reclamation's Feasibility Study for this project was formally submitted to the Congress. Your committee published that report—House Document 378. When first presented to the Congress, the O'Neill Unit was estimated to cost \$68.8 million, or \$894 per acre.

In 1972, the project was re-authorized by the Congress. By then, the costs had climbed to \$113.3 million. Four years later, in 1976, repayment contracts were executed and the project costs had jumped to \$144 million.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By 1982, the new estimated cost was \$368 million, an increase of more than 500 percent since the Feasibility Study was submitted to the Congress. For each of the 77,000 acres to be irrigated, this represents a federal cost of more than \$4,500—or \$1.2 million for each of the approximately 300 farms that would receive project benefits.

Since 1981, the project cost has exceeded its legal cost ceiling, posing still additional problems.

If the project is permitted to proceed, it will destroy the Niobrara River and its unique character as a confluence of six distinct ecosystems. The environmental loss is inestimable.

If built, the project water derived is designed to increase corn and wheat production in the area. Presently, the USDA is paying the same farmers not to grow these commodities. In fact, last year Nebraska farmers destroyed 400,000 acres of corn to comply with this federal program. The contradiction in federal spending policies is staggering.

Unlike some projects which enjoy overwhelming enthusiasm in their home states, the O'Neill project does not have that support. The congressional delegation is divided. In fact, Congressman Douglas K. Bereuter released a critical economic report on the project in 1981. I have reviewed that report and recommend that the Committee review it as well.

Further, the people of Nebraska, in an unprecedented fashion, have spoken. In the last year, the Nebraska Water Conservation Council has talked with citizens throughout the state concerning the project. More than 50,000 residents have signed a petition urging that the project be de-authorized.

Various polls, taken in the last several years, have reached the same conclusion: the project lacks support at home.

In addition to lacking support at home, it now lacks support in the Congress. It is important to examine the vote of last December. Please consider the following:

The Nebraska Congressional delegation is divided on the matter;

The project was rejected by a 101-vote margin in the House last year;

A majority of Democrats voted against the project;

A majority of Republicans voted against the project;

A majority of westerners voted against the project;

A majority of the Interior Committee voted against the project; and

A majority of the Public Works Committee voted against the project.

Even the Appropriations Committee was deeply divided on this matter, a highly unusual situation. Committee members favored the project by only a 26-24 margin.

Mr. Chairman, by any objective standard of review, this project fails every test. Perhaps three decades ago when first authorized it was a reasonable project. However, the magnitude of the problems confronting this project inexorably leads one to the conclusion that it should be terminated.

The substantive and political problems seem insuperable. There are economically and environmentally viable alternatives which could be considered but, as of this writing, have not been given serious attention by the principal sponsor.

Therefore, the Interior Committee is urged to make the adoption of this legislation a top priority in 1983.

6695

I look forward to working with you on this matter and you will have my full cooperation to that end.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. BONIOR,
Member of Congress.●

COMMEMORATION OF COMDR. KENNETH A. PIERCE

HON. FOFO I. F. SUNIA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1983

● Mr. SUNIA. Mr. Speaker, today I join my constituents from American Samoa in honoring one of our territory's greatest diplomats, Lt. Comdr. Kenneth A. Pierce.

Commander Pierce is admired by our people because he accomplished what no other diplomatic Navy leader could. He was responsible for the orderly transfer of the largest number of Samoans to Hawaii and the United States.

His efforts have enabled numerous Samoans to have the opportunities that are offered in our land, not only in the area of employment, but particularly in education. He was a catalyst that brought our people here and has helped Samoan youth to acquire higher educational goals that could not be achieved in our territory that has been short on academic facilities.

Commander Pierce was afforded the chance to assist us because of his assignment by President Harry Truman to take command of the Samoan naval personnel in the early 1950's. Prior to this experience, he served with the U.S. Navy as a personnel officer in Pearl Harbor. He also held command positions as Naval Reserve officer at the U.S. Naval Training Station in Newport, R.I., at Fleet Sonar School in Key West, Fla., and at the Naval Ammunition Depot in Hastings, Nev.

Without the service of Commander Pierce our chance to achieve further development could have been delayed far beyond the time of his leadership.

Along with American Samoans, I wish to commemorate Comdr. Kenneth A. Pierce, a man of honor and a man who offered us hope.●

AMERICAN PRODUCTIVITY

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1983

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months, I have served as chairman of a special task force of the Washington Coordinating Council on Productivity to address a productivity issue that is of particular concern to me—easing the adversarial relationships which exist between American